

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1 - 10, 12, 14 - 32, 36 - 46, 49 and 51 are currently pending in this application. Claims 11, 13, 33 - 35, 47 - 48, 50 and 52 - 55 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 14, 32, 41, 49 and 51 have been amended. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by these amendments.

Telephonic Interview

The Examiner is thanked for granting a telephonic interview with Applicants' representative, Robert Ballarini, on March 14, 2007. During the interview, it was pointed out that the previous office action listed claims 19 and 40 as rejected and objected to as allowable. The Supplemental Office Action corrected that error. The indicated allowability of claims 19 and 40 was deleted and the rejections of claims 19 and 40 remain in effect.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 32 - 37, 39, and 40 were rejected in the Action under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Krampera (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0074853). The cancellation of claims 33 - 35 renders the rejection of those claims moot, the below comments deal with amended claim 32.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. The invention as currently claimed in amended claim 32 is a spoked wheel for a bicycle having an axis and including a hub having a first portion and a second portion, a rim, and a plurality of spokes connecting the hub to the rim. The spokes are arranged in groups comprising an odd number of spokes having a center spoke that extends radially from the hub. At least two of the other spokes cross over one another when viewed in the direction of the wheel's axis. The maximum distance on the rim between the spokes of a group is less than the distance on the rim between the outside spoke of the group and the next spoke that is not part of the group. The spokes that cross over one another are adjacent to one another on the hub.

There is no teaching in Krampera of the spokes that cross each other as being adjacent one another on the hub. The embodiment of Figure 5 of Krampera does not show the other spokes that cross each other (indicated by solid lines) as being adjacent to one another on the hub. Based on the differences noted above, withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claim 32 is respectfully requested. Claims 36 - 37 and 39 - 40 depend from amended claim 32 and are therefore also believed to be allowable for at least the reasons cited above.

Claims 1 - 5, 7, 9, 10, 12 - 18, 20 - 27, 30 - 37, 39, 41 - 44 and 46 - 55 were also rejected in the Action under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Dietrich (U.S. Patent No. 6,145,938). The cancellation of claims 33 - 35, 47 - 48, 50 and 52 - 55

renders the rejection of those claims moot, the comments below will deal with the remaining claims.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. The invention as currently claimed in amended claim 1 is a spoked bicycle wheel, including a hub, having an axis (X) defining the wheel's axis, a rim and a plurality of spokes, that connect the hub to the rim. The spokes are arranged in groups of three, such that the maximum distance on the rim between the spokes of a group is less than the distance on the rim between the outside spoke of the group and the next spoke that is not part of the group. At least two spokes of each group cross over one another when viewed in the direction of the axis (X) of the wheel.

The invention as currently claimed in amended claim 32 is a spoked wheel for a bicycle having an axis and including a hub having a first portion and a second portion, a rim, and a plurality of spokes connecting the hub to the rim. The spokes are arranged in groups comprising an odd number of spokes having a center spoke that extends radially from the hub. At least two of the other spokes cross over one another when viewed in the direction of the wheel's axis. The maximum distance on the rim between the spokes of a group is less than the distance on the rim between the outside spoke of the group and the next spoke that is not part of the group. The spokes that cross over one another are adjacent to one another on the hub.

The invention as currently claimed in amended claim 41 is a rear bicycle wheel including a hub having an axis and a median plane generally perpendicular

to the axis, a rim; and a plurality of spokes, arranged in groups of three, connecting the hub to the rim. The maximum distance on the rim between two adjacent spokes of a group is less than the distance on the rim between two different groups. Each group of spokes has at least two spokes that define a crossover on a first side of the median plane and at least one spoke on a second side of the median plane. The spokes on each side of the median plane produce generally equal forces in opposite directions along the axis that maintain the rim centered about the median plane, two spokes of the group are connected to a hub portion on the first side of the median plane and the other spoke is connected to a hub portion on the second side of the median plane. The hub portions set at an axial distance apart, the spokes are oriented with all of the radially extending spokes on the same hub portion, so that one hub portion has twice the number of spokes than the other hub portion, the hub portion with twice the number of spokes than the other is the hub portion corresponding to the end of the hub which accepts a sprocket cassette.

In contrast, Dietrich describes a bicycle wheel having a hub with a distal flange that has a diameter that is substantially larger than the proximal hub flange. Figure 4 of Dietrich, as modified in the Action, shows "spoke groups" that are not arranged such that the maximum distance on the rim between the spokes of a group is less than the distance on the rim between the outside spoke of the group and the next spoke that is not part of the group, as is currently claimed in amended claim 1.

Additionally, there is no teaching in Dietrich that the spokes are arranged in groups comprising an odd number of spokes having a center spoke that extends radially from the hub. At least two of the other spokes cross over one another when viewed in the direction of the wheel's axis. The spokes that cross over one another being adjacent to one another on the hub, as is currently claimed in amended claim 32.

Furthermore, Dietrich fails to teach that the hub portions as being set at an axial distance apart, the spokes are oriented with all of the radially extending spokes on the same hub portion, so that one hub portion has twice the number of spokes than the other hub portion, the hub portion with twice the number of spokes than the other is the hub portion corresponding to the end of the hub which accepts a sprocket cassette as is claimed in amended claim 41.

Based on the differences noted above, withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claims 1, 32, and 41 is respectfully requested. Claims 2 - 7, 12, and 14 - 31; claims 36 - 40; and 42 - 46, 49 and 51 depend from claims 1, 32 and 41 respectively and are therefore also believed to be allowable for at least the reasons cited above.

In the Action, Claims 32 - 37, 39, and 54 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Jones (U.S. Patent No. 1,642,207).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Further to the comments above, Jones fails to teach the invention as claimed in amended claim 32. There is no teaching in Jones that the maximum distance on the rim between the spokes of a

group is less than the distance on the rim between the outside spoke of the group and the next spoke that is not part of the group. There is also no teaching that the spokes that cross over one another are adjacent to one another on the hub.

Based on the differences noted above, withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claim 32 is respectfully requested. Claims 36 - 40 depend from claim 32 and are likewise believed to be allowable for at least the reasons cited above.

Finally, Claim 54 was rejected under 35. U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Ford (U.S. Patent No. 1,701,843.)

The cancellation of claim 54 renders the rejection of that claim moot.

Based on the arguments presented above, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Dietrich.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 19 depends from claim 1 which, as discussed above, is believed to be allowable. Therefore claim 19 should likewise be allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicant: Passarotto et al.
Application No.: 10/803,291

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1 - 10, 12, 14 - 32, 36 - 46, 49 and 51, is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Passarotto et al.

By /Robert J. Ballarini/
Robert J. Ballarini
Registration No. 48,684

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

RJB/srs